

Best Available Copy

03/05/2008 15:39 FAX 605 339 3357

WOODS FULLER

010

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20 through 27, 31 and 34 through 36 remain in this application. Claims 8 through 12, 14, 19, 28 through 30, 32 and 33 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 6, 13, 15 through 18 and 34 through 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng and Draghetti.

Claims 7, 20 through 27, 31 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng, Draghetti and Kwon.

Claim 1 requires, in part, “displaying on the display device a graphical depiction which illustrates said more probable solution to said fault condition in the connection on the display device” and “displaying on the display device a further graphical depiction which illustrates said less probable solution”.

The claimed system provides a system in which a fault condition is detect, a more probable solution is displayed in a graphical depiction, the system determines is the fault condition is not corrected, and if not corrected the system displays a less probable solution in a graphical depiction.

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

(It is noted that with respect to element (f) of the claims, the rejection refers to Cheng patent at col. 4, lines 48 through 59, but Cheng does not have all of these lines and the lines that are present do not relate to element (f), but rather to a "power saving mode". The undersigned was thus unable to completely respond to the rejections.)

With respect to the requirement in claim 1 of "detecting if said fault condition is present after displaying the graphical depiction of said more probable solution", it is contended that the Cheng patent discloses this requirement at col. 2, lines 60 through 62, which states:

Once the problems are removed, the monitor will operate in a normal manner to display the information from the computer system. An information may be shown on the CRT 18 to indicate the normal operation of the monitor.

However, this portion of Cheng does not indicate that there is any "detection if said fault condition is present", especially so that there can be any determination "if said more probable solution does not correct the fault condition". Here, Cheng merely states that if the "problems are removed", the "monitor will operate", but does not disclose to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Cheng system actually determines or is aware of this. In fact, the statement that an "information may be shown on the CRT 18 to indicate the normal operation of the monitor" simply means that a properly working CRT displays information, much like a television that displays a picture is operating normally and a television that does not display a picture is not operating normally.

More significantly, neither Cheng alone or in the allegedly obvious combination with Draghetti discloses "displaying... [a] more probable solution", and "determining if said fault condition is present after displaying the graphical depiction of said more probable solution", and based upon that determination ("if said probable solution does not correct the fault condition"), then "determining a less probable solution for

Appn. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

correcting said fault condition in the connection" and "displaying of the display device a further graphical depiction which illustrates said less probable solution".

Instead, the cited patents simply discuss the display of different possible problems and solutions without regard to whether the first problem and solution information actually "determining if said fault condition is present after displaying the graphical depiction of said more probable solution" as required by claim 1, and then displaying a further "graphical depiction [of a] less probable solution". Note that Cheng states at col. 2, lines 53 through 63 that (emphasis added):

The trouble-shooting display may comprise any information that the user needs to know to confirm that the monitor is not receiving signal from the computer system. The trouble-shooting display may also contain a series of steps instructing the user to investigate possible problems that the monitor may encounter and possible methods to remove such problems.

Once the problems are removed, the monitor will operate in a normal manner to display the information from the computer system. An information may be shown on the CRT 18 to indicate the normal operation of the monitor.

There is nothing here that suggests that there is any determination of the persistence of a fault condition, and acting in response to that determination as required by the claim.

Further, turning to cited portion of the Draghetti patent, it states at col. 7, lines 9 through 23 that:

In a preferred embodiment not shown, interface device 11 also comprises a help section for solving routine problems on machine 1. In response to user selection of the help section by means of input device 15, bottom portion 24 of screen 16 displays a sequence of diagnostic images, each showing the effect of a given problem on machine 1 and/or packets 2. For example, to illustrate overheating of the lateral-face sealing devices, the corresponding image shows a packet 2 with a shriveled lateral-face seal side. In response to selection of a given diagnostic image, descriptions are provided of the problem and possible causes, and a list is shown of steps to be taken to solve the problem. The list is arranged in decreasing order of probable success,

Appn. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

and the steps listed may be detailed in the form of text strings only, or together with images, photographs or animation, possibly with sound.

There is nothing in this statement that indicates that the Draghetti system displays a probable solution, and determines if that probable solution removes a fault condition, and upon determining that the fault condition is not corrected, determines a less probable solution and displays the less probable solution. To the contrary, the Draghetti patent merely discusses the display of "a list... of steps to be taken to solve the problem", without any attempt to determine if any of the steps as effective.

It is that neither Cheng nor Draghetti, either alone or in an allegedly obvious combination, could lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the specific requirements of claim 1.

It is conceded in the rejection that (emphasis added):

Cheng... doesn't specifically teach providing a primary most probable solution first *before* providing a secondary less probable (than the first solution).

It is then contended that:

Draghetti teaches, in column 7, lines 9-23, providing a user with a help routine for solving problems, via a textual, animation, etc. interface, but further teaches, illustrating the possible solutions in order of probable success.

However, as noted above, the discussion of a listing in a particular order does not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the requirements regarding depicting a more probable solution, determining if the fault condition is corrected by the more probable solution, and depicting a less probable solution when the fault condition is not corrected by the more probable solution.

It is further contended that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Cheng and Draghetti before him at the time the invention was made to modify the help provision system of Cheng to include the ordered providing of help solutions according to

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

probability of it correcting the fault, as is done in Draghetti. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because this would provide the user with a greater chance of correcting the fault via a first provided means of fault correction.

However, the Cheng patent is directed to "interactive monitor troubleshooting", while in contrast the Draghetti patent is directed to an "automatic machine for processing a product" which is in fact a cigarette producing machine. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art of monitor troubleshooting" would not look to art such as Draghetti dealing with automated machines.

Further, it is noted that claims 13, 20, and 26 require the same requirements as claim 1, and in some cases are more detailed than claim 1 with respect to the point set forth above.

It is further stated in the rejection of claim 1 that:

With regard to claim 1, which further teaches (f) displaying of the display device a further graphical depiction which illustrates said further solution, Cheng further teaches, in column 4, lines 48-59, displaying on a monitor a graphical depiction of further trouble shooting steps to a user.

Looking to the Cheng patent, which is referred to at col. 4, lines 48 through 59, it is noted that the Cheng patent ends at col. 4, line 52, and does not reach line 59. Cheng states at vol. 4, lines 48 through 52 that:

5. An interactive monitor trouble-shooting device as claimed in claim 1, further including means for activating a power saving mode when the horizontal and vertical synchronization signals are cut off during normal operation of the monitor.

It is not understood what in this portion of the Cheng patent discloses any "graphical depiction which illustrates [a] more probable solution to [a] fault condition". This portion of the Cheng patent is directed to a "power saving mode", and not to any depiction of a solution.

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

Further, it is submitted that the remainder of the Cheng patent fails to teach or suggest a graphical depiction. In contrast, the Cheng patent appears to clearly discuss the use of text, rather than any graphical depiction. See, for example, Cheng at col. 2, line 64 through col. 3, line 21 (emphasis added):

In accordance with another aspect of the present invention, the display of the trouble-shooting steps is incorporated with a monitor self-testing image to test the color display function of the monitor. An example of the self-testing image is illustrated in FIG. 2, wherein a plurality of words that demonstrate the trouble-shooting steps are displayed. The screen background of the testing image comprises the three elementary colors. For example, in the illustration of FIG. 2, the words "Self Test" has a blue (B) background; "Your monitor is" and "working" have a green (G) background; and "Check the Video" and "Cable and PC" have a red (R) background. All the words are in white color. If any of the three elementary colors is missed, then the user will be readily aware of the missing color. For example, if red is missing, then the background of "Check the Video" and "Cable and PC" disappears and all the words become light blue (the result of combination of blue and green); if green is missing, then the background of "Your monitor is" and "Working" disappears and all the words become pink (the result of combination of blue and red). This provides the user with a measure to check the color display function of the monitor. With this arrangement, the user may test the color display function of the monitor at the same when the trouble-shooting steps are followed to fix the problem of the monitor.

In light of the discussion that clearly sets forth that the "trouble-shooting steps" are set forth in words (as is also clearly illustrated in Figure 2 of Cheng) and not in "graphical depictions", "pictographical depictions", "pictorial depictions" which "illustrate [a] probable solution" as required by the various claims. Thus, it is submitted that Cheng makes it clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the system displays "words", and not graphical depictions "which illustrate [a] probable solution". Even if one were to believe that the background display color was a "graphical depiction" (which it is submitted it is not), the background color still does not "illustrate [a] probable solution" which is required of the "graphical depiction" by the claims.

Appn. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

With respect to the allegedly obvious combination with Kwon, it is noted that the Cheng patent is directed providing verbal (word) instructions on a colored background intended to diagnose the presence or absence of various elements of the video signal, while the Kwon system lacks any verbal (word) instructions or any color diagnostic ability. It is submitted that while the Cheng system is directed to assisting in the diagnosis of a defective connection *after* the connection has been made, the Kwon system is merely directed to showing the connection process prior to connection, but has no ability to provide any of the diagnosis that is central to the Cheng system. It is therefore submitted that the allegedly obvious combination of Cheng and Kwon would not have been suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Cheng, Draghetti, and Kwon set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1, 8, 13, 20 and 26. Further, claims 2 through 7 and claims 34 through 37, which depend from claim 1, claims 15 through 18, which depend from claim 13, claims 21 through 25, which depend from claim 20, claim 27, which depends from claim 26 and claim 31, which depends from claim 8 also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 7, 13, 15 through 18, 20 through 27, 31 and 34 through 37 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/014,308
Amendment dated March 5, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed January 3, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 05 2008

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: March 5, 2008

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357